



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/002,952	11/15/2001	Nobuyuki Takamori	70801-56710	5464
21874	7590	10/08/2004	[REDACTED]	EXAMINER
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP				ANGEBRANNDT, MARTIN J
P.O. BOX 55874			[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
BOSTON, MA 02205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1756

DATE MAILED: 10/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/002,952	TAKAMORI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Martin J Angebranndt	1756

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
 - (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-7 and 9.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The drawing correction filed on 20 September 2004 is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. Other: _____.



Martin J. Angebranndt
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1756

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that although the materials are disclosed by Tajima et al. , as useful for protective layers which have desirable deformation in response to heat and moisture as evidenced by the far right column in tables 4 and 5, which lists the amount of moisture permeation per day. The examiner notes that in the examples corresponding to the cited figures, polycarbonate is used as the substrate (20) and the moisture vapor transmission data is provided. The applicant neglects to account for the fact that low moisture permeability is inherent to hydrophobic materials as is the expansion coefficient under humidity. Contrary to the argued position, these are related and the applicant merely argues that the inherent property is not quantified in the reference. The applicant also argues, that although the instant specification discloses urethane, epoxy, polyester and polyether acrylates as meeting the expansion coefficient under humidity recited in the claims and the applied references use these same materials, the prior art does not meet the claims because they did not have exactly the same consideration as the applicant when choosing these materials. The applicant seeks to dodge the issue that these are inherent properties and burden then placed upon them to perform testing. The examiner holds that the media of the prior art inherently meet the limitations of the claims and most of these do consider tilt/warpage, which would result from poor choices. The rejections stand..


10/15/01